arXiv:1203.0910v1 [math.CO] 5 Mar 2012

ON THE EVALUATION AT $(-i, i)$ OF THE TUTTE POLYNOMIAL OF A BINARY MATROID

R.A.PENDAVINGH

Abstract. Vertigan has shown that if M is a binary matroid, then $|T_M(-i, i)|$, the modulus of the Tutte polynomial of M as evaluated in $(-i, i)$, can be expressed in terms of the bicycle dimension of M. In this paper, we exactly determine $T_M(-i, i)$, and show how to evaluate this number in polynomial time. In particular, we describe how the argument of the complex number $T_M(-i, i)$ depends on a certain $\mathbb{Z}/4\mathbb{Z}$-valued quadratic form that is canonically associated with M.

1. Introduction

The *Tutte polynomial* of a matroid $M = (E, \mathcal{I})$ with rank function r is

$$T_M(x, y) := \sum_{F \subseteq E} (x-1)^{r(E)-r(F)} (y-1)^{|F|-r(F)} \tag{1}$$

Extending the work of Jaeger, Vertigan and Welsh [6], Vertigan investigates the complexity of $\tau^0(\mathcal{M}_\mathbb{F}, x, y)$, the problem of evaluating $T_M(x, y)$ given x, y and a matroid M that is linearly represented over $\mathbb{F}$ [12]. Let $j := e^{i\frac{2\pi}{3}}$ denote a complex third root.

Theorem 1 (Vertigan, 1998). *Let $\mathbb{F}$ be a finite field and $(x, y) \in \mathbb{A}^2$ be a pair other than $(0, 0)$, $(1, 1)$, and such that $(x - 1)(y - 1) \neq 1$. Then the problem $\tau^0(\mathcal{M}_\mathbb{F}, x, y)$ is #P-complete, except when*

- *$|\mathbb{F}| = 2$, and (x, y) is one of $(-1, -1), (0, -1), (-1, 0), (i, -i), (-i, i)$;*
- *$|\mathbb{F}| = 3$, and (x, y) is one of $(j, j^2), (j^2, j)$;*
- *$|\mathbb{F}| = 4$, and (x, y) is $(-1, -1)$*

In the present paper we derive, for a binary matroid M, an explicit expression for $T_M(-i, i)$ that can be evaluated in polynomial time.

To the best of our knowledge, the complexity status of $\tau^0(\mathcal{M}_\mathbb{F}, 1, 1)$, i.e. counting the number of bases of an $\mathbb{F}$-linear matroid, is open for $|\mathbb{F}| = 2, 3, 4$. Otherwise, the above theorem is now complemented by explicit, polynomial-time computable expressions for the value of the Tutte polynomial on each of the special points:

- for any matroid M, $T_M(x, y)$ is trivial to compute if $(x, y) = (0, 0)$ or if $(x - 1)(y - 1) = 1$.
- for binary matroids M, $|T_M(-i, i)|$ was determined by Vertigan [12]. Below, we derive an explicit expression for $T_M(-i, i)$.
- for ternary matroids M, Jaeger [7] has determined $|T_M(j, j^2)|$, and Gioan and Las Vergnas [2] found $T_M(j, j^2)$.

Date: February 24, 2013.

- for quaternary matroids M, $T_M(-1,-1)$ was found by Vertigan [12], extending a result for graphic/binary matroids by Rosenstiehl and Read [10].

The original motivation for this research was a computational problem that arose when writing a matroid package for Sage [11]. Testing whether two matroids are isomorphic can be made more efficient in practice by comparing matroid attributes that are invariants under isomorphism, avoiding more involved computation if the values of the invariants do not match. For general matroids, there are few such invariants that are polynomial-time computable. For binary, ternary and quaternary matroids however, the values of the Tutte polynomial in the above-mentioned special points are clearly the kind of isomorphism invariant we can use for this purpose. With this objective in mind, we shall argue that computing $T_M(-i,i)$ as well as several related invariants takes $O(r(M)^2|E|)$ time all together.

2. PRELIMINARIES

2.1. **Matroids.** A *matroid* is a pair $M=(E,\mathcal{I})$ such that E is a finite set and $\mathcal{I}$ is a set of subsets of E satisfying

- $\emptyset \in \mathcal{I}$
- if $I \in \mathcal{I}$ and $J \subseteq I$, then $J \in \mathcal{I}$
- if $I, J \in \mathcal{I}$ and $|I| < |J|$, then there exists an $e \in J \setminus I$ so that $I \cup \{e\} \in \mathcal{I}$

A set $F \subseteq E$ is an *independent set* of M if $F \in \mathcal{I}$, and F is *dependent* otherwise. The *rank* of a set $F \subseteq E$ is $r(F) := \max\{|I| \mid I \subseteq F, I \in \mathcal{I}\}$. We generally follow Oxley [8] in our matroid notation, with the exception of the definition of linear matroid below.

2.2. **Linear matroids.** If E is a finite set, $\mathbb{F}$ is any field and V is a linear subspace of $\mathbb{F}^E$, then V determines a matroid $M(V) := (E, \mathcal{I}(V))$, where

$$\mathcal{I}(V) := \{F \subseteq E \mid \text{there is no } v \in V \text{ such that } \mathrm{supp}(v) \subseteq F\} \tag{2}$$

Here $\mathrm{supp}(v) := \{e \in E \mid v_e \neq 0\}$. Thus $r(M(V)) = |E| - \dim(V)$. We will denote

$$V/e := \{v_{|E-e} \mid v \in V\}, \tag{3}$$

so that $M(V/e) = M(V)/e$. A matroid $M=(E,\mathcal{I})$ is *linear over* $\mathbb{F}$ if $M = M(V)$ for some linear subspace $V \subseteq \mathbb{F}^E$; then V *represents* M. We write $\mathcal{M}_{\mathbb{F}}$ for the set of matroids linear over the field $\mathbb{F}$. *Binary, ternary* and *quaternary* matroids are matroids linear over $GF(2), GF(3)$ and $GF(4)$, respectively.

2.3. **The bicycle dimension.** Let V be a linear subspace of $\mathbb{F}^E$, where $|\mathbb{F}|$ is one of $2,3,4$. The *bicycle dimension* of V is

$$d(V) := \dim(V \cap V^\perp). \tag{4}$$

Here $V^\perp := \{w \in \mathbb{F}^E \mid < w, v >= 0 \text{ for all } v \in V\}$ as usual, where we take $< w, v > := \sum_i w_i v_i$ if $\mathbb{F} = GF(2), GF(3)$ and $< w, v > := \sum_i w_i^* v_i$, where $^* : GF(4) \to GF(4)$ is the unique nontrivial field epimorphism.

Vertigan shows that if V be a linear subspace of $\mathbb{F}^E$ and $|\mathbb{F}|$ is one of $2,3,4$, then $d(V)$ depends only on $M(V)$.

2.4. **Quadratic forms.** Let V be a finite-dimensional linear space over a field $\mathbb{F}$. Let $b : V \times V \to \mathbb{F}$ be a bilinear form. Then $q : V \to \mathbb{F}$ is a *quadratic form associated with* b if

$$q(\lambda x + \mu y) = \lambda^2 q(x) + \mu^2 q(y) + \lambda\mu b(x, y) \tag{5}$$

for all $\lambda, \mu \in \mathbb{F}$ and $x, y \in V$.

We say that a quadratic form is singular if the associated bilinear form is degenerate, i.e. there exists a nonzero $w \in V$ such that $b(v, w) = 0$ for all $v \in V$. A basis $v_1, \ldots, v_k$ of V is *orthogonal* with respect to b if

$$b(v_i, v_j) = 0 \text{ if } i \neq j \tag{6}$$

The following is well-known.

Lemma 1. *If $b : V \times V \to \mathbb{F}$ is a nondegenerate bilinear form and the field $\mathbb{F}$ has characteristic other than 2, then there exists a basis of V that is orthogonal with respect to b.*

Two quadratic forms q, q' on V are *isomorphic* if $q(v) = q'(L(v))$ for some linear bijection $L : V \to V$. If $v_1, \ldots, v_k$ and $w_1, \ldots, w_k$ are b-orthogonal bases of V and q is a quadratic form associated with b, then $\prod_i q(v_i)$ is a quadratic residue if and only if $\prod_i q(w_i)$ is a quadratic residue. Let $\chi(q) \in \{+1, -1\}$ indicate whether the product is a quadratic residue.

Theorem 2. *If q, q' are nonsingular quadratic forms on V over a field of characteristic other than 2, then q is isomorphic to q' if and only if $\chi(q) = \chi(q')$.*

The case when the characteristic is 2 is somewhat more involved. A basis $v_1, \ldots, v_{2m}$ of V is *alternating* with respect to b if

$$b(v_i, v_j) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } \{i, j\} = \{k, k+m\} \text{ for some } k \in \{1, \ldots, m\} \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \tag{7}$$

Lemma 2. *If $b : V \times V \to \mathbb{F}$ is a nondegenerate bilinear form and the field $\mathbb{F}$ has characteristic 2, then exactly one of the following holds:*

- *V has a basis that is orthogonal with respect to b, or*
- *V has a basis that is alternating with respect to b.*

Brown generalizes quadratic forms over GF(2) to *$\mathbb{Z}/4\mathbb{Z}$-valued quadratic forms* $q : V \mapsto \mathbb{Z}/4\mathbb{Z}$, satisfying

$$q(x + y) = q(x) + q(y) + \alpha(b(x, y)) \tag{8}$$

where $b : V \times V \mapsto GF(2)$ is a bilinear mapping, and $\alpha : GF(2) \to \mathbb{Z}/4\mathbb{Z}$ is the unique nontrivial ring homomorphism (so $\alpha(1) = 2$). Such a quadratic form q is *nondegenerate* resp. *alternating* if and only if the associated bilinear function b is.

Brown (see [13]) defines an invariant $\sigma(q)$ such that

$$\sum_{x \in V} i^{q(x)} = \sqrt{2}^{\dim(V)} e^{\frac{\pi i \sigma(q)}{4}} \tag{9}$$

Wood [13] has classified the $\mathbb{Z}/4\mathbb{Z}$-quadratic forms as follows:

Theorem 3 (Wood,1993). *If q, q' are nonsingular $\mathbb{Z}/4\mathbb{Z}$-valued quadratic forms on V, then q is isomorphic to q' if and only if*

- *$\sigma(q) = \sigma(q')$, and*
- *q is alternating $\Leftrightarrow$ q' is alternating.*

3. A special point of the Tutte polynomial

3.1. **Characterization of $T_M(-i,i)$.** Let V be a linear subspace of $GF(2)^E$, and let $q_V : V \to \mathbb{Z}/4\mathbb{Z}$ be defined by

$$q_V(x) := |\mathrm{supp}(x)| \mod 4 \tag{10}$$

for all $x \in V$. Then $q_V(x+y) = q_V(x) + q_V(y) + \alpha(b(x,y))$ taking $b(x,y) = \sum_i x_i y_i$, so that q_V is a $\mathbb{Z}/4\mathbb{Z}$-valued quadratic form on V.

If $q_V(y) = 0$ for all $y \in V \cap V^\perp$, then for all $x \in V$ and all $y \in V \cap V^\perp$, we have

$$q_V(x+y) = q_V(x) + q_V(y) + \alpha(b(x,y)) = q_V(x) \tag{11}$$

and so then, we may define $\tilde{q}_V : V/(V \cap V^\perp) \to GF(2)$ by setting

$$\tilde{q}_V(x + V \cap V^\perp) = q_V(x). \tag{12}$$

Then $\tilde{q}$ is nonsingular by construction.

Theorem 4. *Let V be a linear subspace of $GF(2)^E$ and let $M := M(V)$. Then*

$$T_M(-i,i) = e^{\frac{\pi i}{4}(\sigma(\tilde{q}_V)+|E|-3r(E))}\sqrt{2}^{d(V)} \tag{13}$$

if $q_V(x) = 0$ for all $x \in V \cap V^\perp$, and $T_M(-i,i) = 0$ otherwise.

Proof. By an application of Greene's formula [4] (as in [12, p.390]), we have

$$\sum_{x \in V} i^{q_V(x)} = i^{r(E)}(1-i)^{|E|-r(E)} T_M(-i,i) \tag{14}$$

Rewriting, we obtain

$$T_M(-i,i) = \sqrt{2}^{-|E|+r(E)} e^{\frac{\pi i}{4}(|E|-3r(E))} \sum_{x \in V} i^{q_V(x)} \tag{15}$$

If $q_V(x) = 2$ for some $x \in V \cap V^\perp$, then $\sum_{x \in V} i^{q_V(x)} = 0$ and hence $T_M(-i,i) = 0$. If on the other hand $q_V(x) = 0$ for all $x \in V \cap V^\perp$, then by (12) we have

$$\sum_{x \in V} i^{q_V(x)} = \sum_{w \in V \cap V^\perp} \sum_{v \in \tilde{V}} i^{q_V(v+w)} = \sum_{w \in V \cap V^\perp} \sum_{v \in \tilde{V}} i^{\tilde{q}_V(v + V \cap V^\perp)} \tag{16}$$

where $\tilde{V}$ is any subspace of V so that $V = (V \cap V^\perp) \oplus \tilde{V}$. The summation over $V \cap V^\perp$ amounts to a factor $2^{d(V)}$, and using (9) on the non-degenerate form $\tilde{q}_V$ we obtain

$$\sum_{x \in V} i^{q_V(x)} = 2^{d(V)} \sqrt{2}^{\dim(\tilde{V})} e^{\frac{\pi i}{4}\sigma(\tilde{q}_V)} \tag{17}$$

Substituting this expression in (15), and using that $|E| - r(M) = \dim(V) = d(V) + \dim(\tilde{V})$, we obtain (13). □

For comparison, we state the characterization of $T(j, j^2)$ due to Gioan and Las Vergnas [2] in similar terms. For a subspace $V \subseteq GF(3)^E$, let $q_V : V \to GF(3)$ be defined by

$$q_V : x \mapsto |\mathrm{supp}(x)| \mod 3 \tag{18}$$

and let $\tilde{q}_V : V/(V \cap V^\perp) \to GF(3)$ be defined by $\tilde{q}_V(x + V \cap V^\perp) = q_V(x)$.

Theorem 5. *Let $V \subseteq GF(3)^E$ be a linear subspace and $M := M(V)$. Then*

$$T_M(j, j^2) = (-1)^{\frac{1-\chi(\tilde{q}_V)}{2}} j^{2|E|-r(M)} (i\sqrt{3})^{d(V)} \tag{19}$$

3.2. **Complexity of $T_M(-i,i)$.** In what follows, let $V \subseteq GF(2)^E$ be a linear subspace of dimension k. A *q-basis* is a basis $v_1, \ldots, v_k$ of V such that

- $v_1, \ldots, v_{k-d(V)}$ is an orthogonal or alternating basis of some subspace $\tilde{V}$ such that $V = \tilde{V} \oplus (V \cap V^\perp)$
- $v_{k-d(V)+1}, \ldots, v_k$ is a basis of $V \cap V^\perp$
- $q_V(v_{k-d(V)+1}) = 0, \ldots, q_V(v_{k-1}) = 0$

Standard linear algebra techniques yield:

Lemma 3. *Given any basis of V, computing a q-basis takes $O(\dim(V)^2|E|)$ time.*

The following is straightforward from the definition of q-basis and (9).

Lemma 4. *Let $v_1, \ldots, v_k$ be a q-basis of V. Then $q_V(v) = 0$ for all $v \in V \cap V^\perp$ if and only if $d(V) = 0$ or $q_V(v_k) = 0$. If so, then*

- *if $v_1, \ldots, v_{k-d(V)}$ is orthogonal, then*

$$\sigma(\tilde{q}_V) = \#\{i \mid q_V(v_i) = 1\} - \#\{i \mid q_V(v_i) = 3\} \mod 8 \tag{20}$$

- *if $v_1, \ldots, v_{k-d(V)}$ is alternating, then*

$$\sigma(\tilde{q}_V) = 4\#\{i \in \{1, \ldots, m\} \mid q_V(v_i) = q_V(v_{i+m})\} \mod 8 \tag{21}$$

  where $m = \frac{k-d(V)}{2}$

Theorem 6. *Let $V \subseteq GF(2)^E$ be a linear subspace. Given any basis of V, the evaluation of $T_{M(V)}(-i,i)$ takes $O(\dim(V)^2|E|)$ time.*

Proof. To compute $T_{M(V)}(-i,i)$, it suffices to determine $|E|$, $\text{rank}(M(V)) = |E| - \dim(V)$, whether $q_V(v) = 0$ for all $v \in V \cap V^\perp$, and if so, $\sigma(\tilde{q}_V)$. Given a q-basis of V, this takes in $O(\dim(V)|E|)$ time. □

As $\dim(V) = |E| - r(M(V)) = r^*(M(V))$, this amounts to a complexity bound of $O(r^*(M(V))^2|E|)$ for evaluating $T_{M(V)}(-i,i)$ from a basis of V. We note that as in general $T_M(x,y) = T_{M^*}(y,x) = \overline{T_{M^*}(\overline{y}, \overline{x})}$, we have

$$T_{M(V)}(-i,i) = \overline{T_{M(V^\perp)}(-i,i)} \tag{22}$$

We may determine the latter in $O(\dim(V^\perp)^2|E|) = O(r(M(V))^2|E|)$ time from any basis of $V^\perp$.

3.3. **The canonical tripartition.** Let $V \subseteq GF(2)^E$. We consider

$$F_i := \{e \in E \mid d(V/e) = d(V) + i\}. \tag{23}$$

Lemma 5. *Let $v_1, \ldots, v_k$ be a q-basis of V. Then*

- *$F_{-1} := \bigcup_{i=k-d(V)+1}^{k} supp(v_i)$*
- *$F_1 := supp(\sum_{i=1}^{k-d(V)} v_i) \setminus F_{-1}$ if the q-basis is orthogonal, $F_1 = \emptyset$ otherwise*
- *$F_0 = E \setminus (F_{-1} \cup F_1)$*

In particular, $F_i = \emptyset$ for any $i \notin \{-1, 0, 1\}$.

Proof. Let A be any $k \times E$ matrix over $GF(2)$ such that $V = \text{rowspace}(A)$. Then $V^\perp = \text{kernel}(A)$, and $d(V) = \dim(V \cap V^\perp) = k - \text{rank}(AA^T)$. If we write

$$A^e := A[\{1, \ldots, k\}, E - e] \text{ and } a^e := A[\{1, \ldots, k\}, e] \tag{24}$$

for $e \in E$, then $V/e = \text{rowspace}(A^e)$ and $d(V/e) = k - \text{rank}(A^e(A^e)^T)$. Thus

$$d(V/e) - d(V) = \text{rank}(AA^T) - \text{rank}(AA^T + a^e(a^e)^T) \tag{25}$$

Now consider the matrix A whose rows are the given q-basis of V.

If $e \in \text{supp}(v_i)$ for some $i > k - d(V)$, so $a_i^e \neq 0$, then consider the matrix B that arises by adding the i-th row of A to the rows $j \in \text{supp}(a^e) - \{i\}$. Then the rows of B again form a q-basis of V, b^e is a unit vector, and hence $d(V/e) - d(V) = \text{rank}(BB^T) - \text{rank}(BB^T + b^e(b^e)^T) = -1$.

If $a_i^e = 0$ for all $i > k - d(V)$, then $d(V/e) - d(V) = \text{rank}(AA^T) - \text{rank}(AA^T + a^e(a^e)^T) = \text{rank}(BB^T) - \text{rank}(BB^T + b^e(b^e)^T)$ where $B = A[\{1, \ldots, k - d(V)\}, E]$. So without loss of generality, we may assume $d(V) = 0$.

In case the rows of A are orthogonal, let $B := A[\text{supp}(a^e), E]$. Then $d(V/e) - d(V) = \text{rank}(AA^T) - \text{rank}(AA^T + a^e(a^e)^T) = \text{rank}(BB^T) - \text{rank}(BB^T + b^e(b^e)^T) = \text{rank}(I) - \text{rank}(I + J)$, where J is an all-one matrix with $|\text{supp}(a^e)|$ rows/columns. Then $d(V/e) - d(V) = 1$ if $\sum_i a_i^e = |\text{supp}(a^e)| \mod 2 = 1$, and 0 otherwise.

In case the rows of A are alternating, it remains to show that $d(V/e) - d(V) = 0$, i.e. that $AA^T + a^e(a^e)^T$ is nonsingular. If not, there is a nonzero vector $x \in GF(2)^k$ so that $(AA^T + a^e(a^e)^T)x = 0$, or equivalently, so that $AA^Tx = a^e(a^e)^Tx$. As $AA^Tx \neq 0$, we must have $(a^e)^Tx = 1$ and hence $AA^Tx = a^e$. As

$$AA^Tx = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & I \\ I & 0 \end{bmatrix} x = (x_{k/2+1}, \ldots, x_k, x_1, \ldots, x_{k/2})^T, \tag{26}$$

this implies that $(a^e)^Tx = 0$, a contradiction. □

The triple (F_{-1}, F_0, F_1) is known as the *canonical tripartition* of V. Originally this notion was developed for graphs by Rosenstiehl and Read [10], but the generalization to binary spaces is straightforward. As is clear from the lemma, the determination of the canonical tripartition takes $O(\dim(V)|E|)$ time given a q-basis of V.

3.4. A projection.

3.4. A projection. Following Godsil and Royle[3], we call a subspace $V \subseteq GF(2)^E$ *pedestrian* if the 'bicycle space' $V \cap V^\perp$ is trivial, i.e. if $d(V) = 0$.

Pedestrian spaces are not rare. Fixing a subspace $W \subseteq GF(2)^E$ of dimension k, there are exactly 2^k distinct subspaces $V \subseteq GF(2)^{E+e}$ such that $\dim(V) = k$ and $V/e = W$. Of these spaces V, exactly $2^k - 2^{k-d(W)}$ satify $d(V) = d(W) - 1$. From the remaining $2^{k-d(V)}$, exactly half has $d(V) = d(W)$, half has $d(V) = d(W)+1$. A straightforward analysis shows that if $|E|$ tends to infinity, slightly less than 3/7-th of the subspaces $V \subseteq GF(2)^E$ of dimension k will be pedestrian.

If $V \subseteq GF(2)^E$ is a pedestrian subspace then $GF(2)^E = V \oplus V^\perp$, i.e any vector $x \in GF(2)^E$ can be uniquely written as $x = v + w$, where $v \in V$ and $w \in V^\perp$. Hence there is a unique linear map $\pi_V : GF(2)^E \to V$ so that $\pi_V(x) \in V$ and $x - \pi_V(x) \in V^\perp$ for all $x \in GF(2)^E$. The matrix Q_V so that $\pi_V(x) = Q_Vx$ is textbook material in linear algebra; it is

$$Q_V = A^T(AA^T)^{-1}A \tag{27}$$

where A is any matrix with independent rows such that rowspace$(A) = V$. That AA^T is invertible follows from our assumption that V is pedestrian, that $Q_V \in$ rowspace$(A) = V$ is clear, and we have $x - Q_Vx \in$ kernel$(A) = V^\perp$ since

$$A(x - Q_Vx) = A(x - A^T(AA^T)^{-1}Ax) = Ax - AA^T(AA^T)^{-1}Ax = 0 \tag{28}$$

It is not difficult to determine Q_V from a q-basis of V.

Lemma 6. *Let $V \subseteq GF(2)^E$ be a pedestrian linear subspace, and let $v_1,\dots,v_k$ be a q-basis of V. Then*

$$Q_V = \sum_{i=1}^{k} v_i v_i^T \text{ or } Q_V = \sum_{i=1}^{k/2} v_i v_{i+k/2}^T + v_{i+k/2} v_i^T \tag{29}$$

if the basis is orthogonal or alternating, respectively.

Proof. Let A be the matrix whose rows are $v_1,\dots,v_k$. Then

$$AA^T = I \text{ or } AA^T = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & I \\ I & 0 \end{bmatrix} \tag{30}$$

depending on whether the q-basis is orthogonal or alternating. The result now follows from (27). $\square$

Let G_V be the support graph of the $E \times E$ matrix Q_V, so $V(G_V) = E$ and

$$E(G_V) = \{ef \mid (Q_V)_{ef} \neq 0\} \tag{31}$$

Theorem 7. *If $V \subseteq GF(2)^E$ and $V' \subseteq GF(2)^{E'}$ are pedestrian binary spaces, then $M(V)$ is isomorphic to $M(V')$ if and only if G_V is isomorphic to $G_{V'}$.*

Binary matroid isomorphism may thus be reduced to graph isomorphism in the time it takes to write G_V, which is $O(\dim(V)|E|^2)$.

If we do not assume that V is pedestrian, then we may still write

$$(V + V^{\perp})/(V \cap V^{\perp}) = V/(V \cap V^{\perp}) \oplus V^{\perp}/(V \cap V^{\perp}) \tag{32}$$

Hence there is a unique linear map $\tilde{\pi}_V : (V + V^{\perp})/(V \cap V^{\perp}) \to V/(V \cap V^{\perp})$ such that

$$\tilde{\pi}_V(x) \in V/(V \cap V^{\perp}) \text{ and } x - \tilde{\pi}_V(x) \in V^{\perp}/(V \cap V^{\perp}) \tag{33}$$

for all $x \in (V + V^{\perp})/(V \cap V^{\perp})$. Clearly, $\tilde{\pi}_V$ coincides with π_V if V is pedestrian.

Lemma 7. *Let $V \subseteq GF(2)^E$ be a linear space and let $\tilde{V}$ be any subspace of V such that $V = \tilde{V} + (V \cap V^{\perp})$. Then $\tilde{\pi}_V(x + (V \cap V^{\perp})) = \pi_{\tilde{V}}(x) + (V \cap V^{\perp})$ for any $x \in V + V^{\perp}$.*

Proof. Let $x \in V + V^{\perp}$. If $\tilde{W} \subseteq V^{\perp}$ is such that $V^{\perp} = \tilde{W} \oplus (V \cap V^{\perp})$, then $V + V^{\perp} = \tilde{V} \oplus \tilde{W} \oplus (V \cap V^{\perp})$ and we may write $x = v + w + z$, where $v \in \tilde{V}$, $w \in \tilde{W}$, $z \in V \cap V^{\perp}$. Then

$$\tilde{\pi}_V(x + (V + V^{\perp})) = v + (V \cap V^{\perp}) = \pi_{\tilde{V}}(x) + (V \cap V^{\perp}) \tag{34}$$

as required. $\square$

And so we have

$$\tilde{\pi}_V(x + (V \cap V^{\perp})) = Q_{\tilde{V}} x + (V \cap V^{\perp}) \tag{35}$$

for any $\tilde{V}$ such that $V = \tilde{V} + (V \cap V^{\perp})$. Such a $\tilde{V}$ is determined as the span of the first $k - d(V)$ vectors of a q-basis of V.

If (F_{-1}, F_0, F_1) is the canonical tripartition of V, then from Lemma 5 we have

$$F_{-1} = \bigcup \{\mathrm{supp}(v) \mid v \in V \cap V^{\perp}\} \tag{36}$$

Then $(Q_{\tilde{V}})_{ef}$ is independent of the choice $\tilde{V}$ if $e, f \in F := E \setminus F_{-1}$, since then

$$< e_e + (V \cap V^{\perp}), \tilde{\pi}_V(e_f + (V \cap V^{\perp})) >= e_e^T Q_{\tilde{V}} e_f = (Q_{\tilde{V}})_{ef} \tag{37}$$

Let $\tilde{G}_V$ denote the support graph of $Q_{\tilde{V}}[F,F]$. Then $\tilde{G}_V = G_V$ if V is pedestrian. Theorem 7 thus extends to non-pedestrian spaces in a weaker form:

Theorem 8. *If* $V \subseteq GF(2)^E$ *and* $V' \subseteq GF(2)^{E'}$ *are binary spaces, then* $M(V)$ *is isomorphic to* $M(V')$ *only if* $\tilde{G}_V$ *is isomorphic to* $\tilde{G}_{V'}$.

4. Some remarks and conjectures

4.1. **Counting bases.** As was mentioned in the introduction, the complexity of the following problem appears to be open for any fixed field $\mathbb{F}$:

given: a basis of a subspace $V \subseteq \mathbb{F}^E$
find: the number of bases of $M(V)$

Vertigan announced the resolution of this issue in [12], but the paper he refers to remains unpublished. It seems natural to conjecture that this problem is #P-complete.

In contrast, the matrix-tree Lemma states that if M is a regular matroid represented by a totally unimodular matrix A with independent rows, then the number of bases of M equals $\det(AA^T)$. This result generalizes to sixth-root-of-unity matroids and even quaternionic-unimodular matroids (see [9] for the extension of the matrix-tree lemma to quaternionic matroids, as well as a noteworthy use of the matrix Q_V in relation to counting bases in minors of $M(V)$).

A bold conjecture one might phrase is that any minor-closed class of matroids of *quadratic growth rate* (see [1]) is such that the number of bases of a matroid in the class is computable in polynomial time from some succint description of the matroid. As leaving the nature of the succinct description open make this conjecture a bit too vague, we will be more specific. We conjecture: if $\mathbb{P}$ is a partial field so that the class of matroids representable over $\mathbb{P}$ has quadratic growth rate, the the problem

given: a $\mathbb{P}$-matrix A
find: the number of bases of $M(A)$

is polynomial-time computable. In particular, this conjecture would imply that counting the bases of a dyadic matroid takes polynomial time.

4.2. **Isomorphism testing for binary matroids.** We consider the problem:

given: bases for subspaces $V \subseteq GF(2)^E, V' \subseteq GF(2)^{E'}$
decide: if $M(V)$ is isomorphic to $M(V')$

This problem properly contains isomorphism testing for 3-connected graphs, and by a simple reduction the general graph isomorphism problem. The complexity of the latter problem remains open to this day. In practice one's best option for solving graph isomorphism is to use a canonical labelling algorithm as was described and implemented by McKay.

We described several isomorphism invariants that one could compute from a basis of V in just $O(\dim(V)|E|^2)$ time:

- $T_{M(V)}(-i,i)$
- the cardinalities of the F_i in the canonical tripartition (F_{-1},F_0,F_1)
- the number of edges of $\tilde{G}_V, \tilde{G}[F_0]$ and $\tilde{G}[F_1]$

In a random selection of 10000 subspaces of $GF(2)^{30}$ of dimension 10, all but 324 of the pairs of were revealed to generate non-isomorphic matroids by a comparison of these invariants, or were identified as isomorphic by an application of Theorem 7. This means that in less than 1 in 100.000 cases, it was necessary to revert to other methods for testing isomorphism. As the time to compute the invariants is comparable in practice to the time it takes to compute the rank of a few sets X in $M(V)$ from a basis of V, this results in a sharp reduction in the average time taken by the isomorphism test.

In a forthcoming Sage package for matroid computation, this technique has been implemented to speed up the isomorphism test for binary matroids, and similar methods have been implemented for ternary and quaternary matroids.

Haggard, Pearce and Royle [5] describe a practical algorithm to compute the Tutte polynomial of a graph, which makes extensive use of graph isomorphism testing to reduce the overall computational effort. A possible application of our isomorphism test would be the extension of their method to a practical algorithm for computing the Tutte polynomial of a binary matroid.

5. Acknowledgement

We thank Judith Keijsper for a stimulating conversation on the nature of orthogonal projection in binary spaces.

References

[1] Jim Geelen, Joseph P. S. Kung, and Geoff Whittle. Growth rates of minor-closed classes of matroids. *J. Combin. Theory Ser. B*, 99(2):420–427, 2009.

[2] Emeric Gioan and Michel Las Vergnas. On the evaluation at (j, j^2) of the Tutte polynomial of a ternary matroid. *J. Algebraic Combin.*, 25(1):1–6, 2007.

[3] Chris Godsil and Gordon Royle. *Algebraic graph theory*, volume 207 of *Graduate Texts in Mathematics*. Springer-Verlag, New York, 2001.

[4] Curtis Greene. Weight enumeration and the geometry of linear codes. *Studies in Appl. Math.*, 55(2):119–128, 1976.

[5] Gary Haggard, David J. Pearce, and Gordon Royle. Computing Tutte polynomials. *ACM Trans. Math. Software*, 37(3):Art. 24, 17, 2010.

[6] F. Jaeger, D. L. Vertigan, and D. J. A. Welsh. On the computational complexity of the Jones and Tutte polynomials. *Math. Proc. Cambridge Philos. Soc.*, 108(1):35–53, 1990.

[7] François Jaeger. Tutte polynomials and bicycle dimension of ternary matroids. *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 107(1):17–25, 1989.

[8] James Oxley. *Matroid theory*, volume 21 of *Oxford Graduate Texts in Mathematics*. Oxford University Press, Oxford, second edition, 2011.

[9] Rudi Pendavingh and Stefan van Zwam. Representing some non-representable matroids. *preprint*, 2011. http://arxiv.org/abs/1106.3088.

[10] P. Rosenstiehl and R. C. Read. On the principal edge tripartition of a graph. *Ann. Discrete Math.*, 3:195–226, 1978. Advances in graph theory (Cambridge Combinatorial Conf., Trinity College, Cambridge, 1977).

[11] W. A. Stein et al. *Sage Mathematics Software (Version 4.8.0)*. The Sage Development Team, 2012. http://www.sagemath.org.

[12] Dirk Vertigan. Bicycle dimension and special points of the Tutte polynomial. *J. Combin. Theory Ser. B*, 74(2):378–396, 1998.

[13] Jay A. Wood. Witt's extension theorem for mod four valued quadratic forms. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 336(1):445–461, 1993.